Mr. Belur Srinivasiengar.—

Are not the materials required here the same as those in Madras?

Second Member of Council.—

We are concerned with the problem as we find it here.

Mr. Belur Srinivasiengar.—

Is it not a fact that the Assembly has been pressing for the extension of the Ayurvedic system in the rural areas?

Second Member of Council.—

Yes.

Mr. H. B. Gundappa.—

With reference to Answer (4), what is the cause of the large disparity in the amount of interest realised?

Second Member of Council.—

Reduction in the Savings Bank rate of interest.

MESSRS. K. T. SATHYANARAYANA SETTY and N. M. SIVALINGAPPAIYA (Kadur Taluk).—

Q.—20. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) Under what circumstances was the Large Landed Estate Scheme abolished and what are the reasons for the same?

(2) Was the matter of abolition of the said scheme brought before this House for opinion?

(3) How many applicants were given lands since the introduction of the scheme?

CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT.—

A.—20. (1) The reasons for the abolition of the scheme are to be found in G.O. No. R. 8191-205—L.R. 17-26-9, dated the 7th June 1927, of which a copy will be furnished to the member if required.

(2) No.

(3) Twenty-eight applications were sanctioned under the scheme up to the end of January 1926.

Supplementary Questions and Answers.

Mr. K. T. Sathyanarayana Setty.—

With reference to answer to Question (2), why was not the Assembly consulted before the abolition of the scheme?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

It was not necessary to consult the Assembly.

Mr. K. T. Sathyanarayana Setty.—

Were the Deputy Commissioners consulted in particular cases?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

Cannot say.

Mr. K. T. Sathyanarayana Setty.—

Do not Government consider that the opinion of the Deputy Commissioners should have been taken?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

Government were sufficiently aware of the views of experienced officers in this matter.

Mr. K. T. Sathyanarayana Setty.—

Are Government going to revive the scheme?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

It is not contemplated.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

When was the scheme started?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

About 12 years back.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

How many applications were received for lands under this scheme?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

I want notice.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

On whose recommendation was the scheme originally started?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

The Economic Conference.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Was the Board of Agriculture consulted before its abolition?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

No.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Was it not necessary?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

No.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Was either the Representative Assembly or the Legislative Council consulted?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

No.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Were not the rules regarding the grant of lands under this scheme changed recently?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

They were changed from time to time but the response was not adequate.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Was not the lack of response due to the fault of the Revenue authorities who went on applying the ordinary *darkhast* rules in the case of applications for large landed estates? And was not this point made specific in the revised order?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

I do not think so.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

How many grants have been cancelled?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

In a few cases they have been cancelled.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Was it done before or after the issue of the revised order?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

I believe both before and after the issue of orders in 1924.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Are Government aware that the colonisation scheme is in force in Hyderabad?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

It does not relate to the question at issue.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

How many lands were given at upset price?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

The question requires notice.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Will Government revise their order?

Chief Secretary to Government.—

Revision of the order is not contemplated at present.

At this stage, the Assembly rose for lunch and re-assembled at 3-30 P.M.